



1 | been served, and therefore the consent of these two  
2 | Defendants was not required for removal. (Notice of  
3 | Removal ¶ 4.)

4 | On September 18, 2008, removing Defendant Twin City  
5 | was dismissed. On September 24, 2008, Defendant The  
6 | Hartford was likewise dismissed. Apparently, only  
7 | Defendant RSUI Indemnity Company and the Doe Defendants  
8 | remain.

9 | To date, it is unclear whether the remaining  
10 | Defendant, RSUI Indemnity Company, has been served with  
11 | notice of the Complaint. Further, it is unclear whether  
12 | Defendant RSUI Indemnity Company consents to removal to  
13 | this Court.

14 | Accordingly, the Parties in this matter are **ORDERED**  
15 | **TO SHOW CAUSE** regarding:

- 16 | 1. Why this matter should not be closed; and  
17 | 2. Why this matter should not be remanded to the  
18 | Los Angeles Superior Court.

19 | The parties are to respond within **10 DAYS**.

20 |  
21 | **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/ s /

22 |  
23 | **HONORABLE RONALD S.W. LEW**  
24 | Senior, U.S. District Court Judge

25 |  
26 |  
27 |  
28 | DATED: November 5, 2008